

STATE OF MAINE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 2002-458

OCTOBER 21, 2002

CONSUMERS MAINE WATER COMPANY
Proposed Increase in Rates
For Its Hartland Division

ADVISOR'S DATA REQUEST NO. 2
(RESPOND BY OCTOBER 25, 2002)

I. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please provide the response to each numbered request on a separate sheet of paper, or papers. Each sheet of paper should be three-hole punched.
2. For each response, please state (1) the name(s) and title(s) of the person(s) responsible for preparing the response, and (2) the name(s) and title(s) of the person(s) who are competent to give testimony concerning the response and all documents produced as part of the responses.
3. Where information requested is not available in the precise form described in the question, or is not available for all years indicated, please provide all information with respect to the subject matter of the question that can be identified in the Utility's Workpapers and files, or that is otherwise available.
4. As used in this data request, "available" means within the Utility's knowledge, possession, or control, or within the party's power, capacity or ability to retrieve or obtain from an affiliate, a contractor, or any other source.
5. Please file responses to oral data requests under separate cover.

II. DATA REQUESTS

1. Please explain why this agreement is just and reasonable and in the best interest of the ratepayer.
2. Please explain Part III.6 of the Stipulation. Does this provision mean that the "Starbird facilities" will remain in operating property until they are no longer used or useful as a backup supply?

3. Please accurately describe the precedent that is proposed to be established by Part III.6 of the Stipulation.
4. The Company has proposed an annual public fire protection charge equal to \$96,804.48, which is 33.19% of total revenues. Has the Company advised the Town of Hartland that this charge exceeds the level determined by Chapter 69 of the Commission's Rules? If so, what was the Town's response?
5. The pro forma bad debt expense of \$2,638 is based upon a five-year average that includes abnormal write-offs in 1997, 1998, and 1999. The average write-offs for 2000 and 2001 is \$571. Adjusted to reflect the proposed 74.7% rate increase, it would equal \$887. How is the difference accounted for in the Stipulation?
6. Has the Company hired utility worker #5 included at \$11,934 plus benefits? If not, when will the worker be hired?
7. The Company has proposed that overtime will continue at the historic average of \$2,666. The addition of another worker would suggest that overtime should be reduced. Please explain. How is this accounted for in the Stipulation?
8. Please provide a schedule detailing the Company's rate case expense to date.

Dated: October 21, 2002

Submitted by,

Lucretia A. Smith
Utility Analyst